1		CALIFORNIA STATE ALLOCATION BOARD
2		FULL-DAY KINDERGARTEN FACILITIES GRANT PROGRAM
3		STAKEHOLDER MEETING
4		
5		
6		
7		STATE CAPITOL ROOM 447
8		SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
9		
10		
11		DATE: THURSDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2018
12		TIME: 10:03 A.M.
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20 21		
22	Reported by:	SUSAN PALMER
23	reported by.	eScribers
24		
25		
_•		

Γ

1	A DDEADANGEG.
	APPEARANCES:
2	REPRESENTATIVES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES, OFFICE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION (OPSC) PRESENT:
3	MICHAEL WATANABE, Chief, Program Services
4	
5	BRIAN LAPASK, Policy & Operations Manager, Program Services
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS

MR. WATANABE: Welcome. Today is October 4th,
2018. This is the third stakeholder meeting from the State
Allocation Board for a Full-Day Kindergarten Facilities
Grant Program.

I am Michael Watanabe, Chief of Program Services for OPSC, and with me is Brian LaPask, our Policy Operations Manager.

So about this meeting today, this is -- like I said, this is our third meeting. We had one back in August and September. If you'd like to view those webcasts, they are available on our website.

Today -- as a result of all the feedback we received at those meetings and the email and phone calls after those stakeholder meetings, what we brought back today is proposed forms, regulations, and a grant agreement for administering the program.

We welcome any feedback after this meeting. We're hoping that by COB next Thursday that we get additional feedback on anything you've heard today or as we've gone through the regs, some thoughts on those. We'd appreciate that back as soon as possible.

Our ideal goal is to take these regs to the October 24th Board meeting for presentation to the State Allocation Board for approval so that we can move these regulations through the administrative process.

A little bit of background. If you're not familiar, Assembly Bill 1808 added the Full-Day Kindergarten Facilities Grant Program to the Education Code. As part of the 2018-2019 Budget Act, a hundred million was provided by the budget in cash to provide one time grant funds to school districts that either lack facilities for a full-day kindergarten or they have a need to retrofit facilities for a full-day kindergarten.

So what we'll do today is Brian and I will walk through the grant agreement, the regulations, kind of highlight what each one does and if you'd like, we can go farther in the weeds to the specifics of each of the regulations.

Before we go into the regs, we do want to address any questions and comments we received from the last meeting, so we'll take care of that part first.

MR. LAPASK: All right. Brian LaPask, OPSC. So if you turn to page 2 in the packet, there's a few questions and answers we had outstanding from the last meeting.

If you look over the last two meeting items that we published, there's a bunch of Q and A's in those too and

we actually have implemented I think everything that was either missing from the program or we thought the program could allow.

So we've incorporated all that stuff. We also incorporated the things from these questions, but these are the ones that came up at the last meeting.

So the first one is basically asking if you're doing a like-for-like replacement of an entire school or part of a school, if you could combine that -- the modernization project with the full-day kindergarten project, so it'd be like a hybrid SFP modernization as well as full-day kindergarten.

And basically, the answer's yes, you can do that. You would need to qualify for the full-day kindergarten program in and of itself, meaning that you'd have to meet all the qualifications for that portion of the project.

Just like the SFP project, you have to meet the qualifications for that portion of it.

And we would only ask that you clearly delineate in all your documents and your plans and, of course, your expenditures as well just clearly which classrooms and which work goes to which project, just like with any other hybrid project really. So we don't see any issue with that.

Next one is are transitional kindergarten pupils, basically are they part of the kindergarten population, are

they a part of this program, and the answer is yes. For the purposes of full-day kindergarten, there's no distinguishing between transitional kindergarten and kindergarten pupils, but we do look at them in totality.

So we don't provide facilities for them separately, but we would, you know, combine the enrollment that you have for both of those different populations of students and we would provide facilities accordingly.

The third question, is there a specific format for the required full-day kindergarten program resolution that the district turns in, and we'll talk about the particulars of what's in the resolution later, but we don't have a template at this time. We may have one in the future. I'm not sure, but it's really up to the district what they'd like to put in there.

There are a few minimum things you have to have in there, but aside from that, it's kind of at your discretion what you want to put in there.

The last question on page 2 is basically asking ——
I can read the entire thing, but basically what it's asking is if you have a site, either a situation where you're adding kindergarten grade level to a site that doesn't currently have it or if you're expanding to some kind, could you use full-day kindergarten funds for that.

We don't think the statute provides for that

ability. It's not to provide for growth. It's to house existing kindergarten or transitional kindergarten pupils, and so if you don't have kindergarteners there right now, you're not -- there's no CBEDS at the site for kindergarten and there's -- you're basically -- that site is growing to include kindergarten kids.

Whether or not you're expanding your classroom base isn't really the issue. It's just that you're providing for kindergarten kids that aren't there right at that moment, so they're not existing kindergarten kids. So we don't think it fits in the program.

And then the last question on page 3, do full-day kindergarten projects have to participate in a priority funding round. The answer's no.

We already have the cash available for the program and the reason why we do priority funding in the School Facility Program is that we have to wait for bond sales. So we don't have that here, so the funds will be released pretty much as soon as you're ready for them.

Okay. With that, I'm going to go quite a ways forward in the package and talk about the regulations. It's on page 47 if you're following along.

And we created these -- a lot of the information you'll see in here is very similar to the School Facility Program. We basically took some of the ideas that are

incorporated in both programs and just kind of tailored them
for full-day kindergarten, and I'll talk about which ones
are brand new, which ones are -- you know, kind we did that.
We kind of manufactured them.

But just kind of going through them. So the first one, 1860 is -- you'll notice it's a different rule set.

It's not 1859 the way the School Facility Program regulations are and that's because this is outside of the School Facility Program.

So it starts with 1860. That first one there is just general program information. What it provides, there's a hundred million dollars available, et cetera.

1860.1 just talks about how the -- well,
basically, OPSC will carry out the program on behalf of the
DGS director. And then 1860.2 is the definition section.
Most of these are -- come out of the SFP. They won't look
new to you. There are a few that are different. I'll
highlight those.

On stamped page 48, down at the bottom, we have our new forms. We define what a full-day kindergarten classroom is. We redefine the word fund to be, you know, for the full-day kindergarten.

And then kind of moving on on page 49, we define low income which I think may or may not be already in the SFP, but it's really important in this program because

that's going to determine the funding priority.

New construction, you know, and new construction grant are updated to include full-day kindergarten provision, and then on the last page -- on page 50, we have the retrofit information and we define program to mean the Full-Day Kindergarten Facilities Grant Program for this rule set.

Moving on to page 51, the header down at the bottom of page 50, it's 1860.3 for general. This just basically is saying that you must file a 70-01 when you apply for funds, which is very similar to the 50-04 for SFP. It's a funding request.

And then going down under funding guidelines, part of the statutory requirements of this program is that all the funds must be encumbered by the Board by June 30th of 2021. So we've had -- we're outlining what happens if we get funds back in the meantime.

So if we get funds that either are returned or are unspent, whatever they might be, if it's before the program ends, if it's before that date, they'll return to the FDK fund.

If they come back after that date, they'll actually go back to the general fund where the allocation for the program originated from. So that's what that details.

1860.5 is program eligibility criteria and there's basically four provisions here -- or maybe just three.

There's three of them.

You have to have -- with the 70-01, you have to turn in a school board resolution providing approval to provide full-day kindergarten instruction at the school site that's being requested.

You're certifying that the district lacks the facilities to provide full-day kindergarten instruction, and along with the application, there should be a description of the project that includes the total number of kindergarten classrooms at the site before the project, the total kindergarten enrollment at the site, and again, that will include TK, and then the total number of classrooms that will be at the site at the completion of the project and then also the overall increase to the number of classrooms, if there is any, to the overall school site.

 $\hbox{So those are the kind of $--$ the things that must} \\$ $\hbox{come in with your form.}$

Application submittal periods -- going over to page 52. We have two funding rounds outlined. They're coming quick and the reason for that is because of the requirement to have the funds encumbered, you know, within about three years.

So the first funding round's going to begin

January 2nd of next year, 2019. It will run through the end of January and then the second funding round will be May 1st through May 30th of 2019. So we realize that's a quick turnaround.

That's also why we've provided the ability to come in without having DSA or CDE approvals in place. You can get advanced funds.

So we're hoping that that works out. We wanted to give everyone the maximum amount of time and that's the reason why we designed that the way we did.

1860.7 is the application types, so there's basically four of those. There's a standard new construction grant where you have all your approvals in place and then there's a new construction with advance. You can get advance for design and/or site acquisition, just like with SFP.

And then same thing with the modern. In this program, it's called retrofit. You can get a retrofit grant if you have all your approvals or you can come in for an advance for design.

If you do have an advance application, you have 12 months from the apportionment to come in with your approvals. So it's very similar to career tech, for example.

Moving down, 1860.8, the district must hold title

to the land where the project will be built. And then over on page 53, to determine the apportionment level, there's a few sections in there and basically what it's talking about is we're going to use the SFP level K through 6 base grant for the number of the pupils in the projects.

There's add-ons for fire alarms, sprinkler, and then we decided to, instead of having the normal site development worksheet that we have with SFP projects, we're just giving 35 percent for these projects -- 35 percent of the base grant will be allocated for site development.

And that number, where that comes from, is we looked at all the new construction projects we've ever funded through the SFP since back to 1998 and what percentage of those allocations included site development and it came out to be like 34.8 percent.

So we've used that number, 35 percent, before. We used it for guesstimating facility hardship projects and how much site development will cost, and so it's a number that we've used before and it really kind of just worked out when we looked at the metrics for it.

So 35 percent for site development. 12 percent if you're increasing the base grant, if you're building multilevel classrooms in the project, and then there's also project assistance available for these projects.

All of these amount will not be -- not all of

them, but the per pupil grant amount and the fire alarm and sprinkler grants will be increased every year with the construction cost index just like it is with SFP.

Moving on down to -- the next few sections are really talking about site acquisition. I don't think I need to mention much here. I think most of you are familiar with the way site acquisition works for the School Facility Program. It's pretty much identical.

The only couple things I wanted to call out were that at our previous meetings, we had been talking about leased sites and provisions around using the funds at leased sites, but the more we looked into the statute, we don't think that FDK statutes provide the ability to provide funding at leased sites. So we've taken that out.

If somebody sees it differently, we'd love to hear from you about it, but we looked pretty carefully and we just don't see the ability to provide the funds at leased sites.

The other thing, if you look over at page 54 -- stamped page 54, we do plan on prorating -- we're going to reduce the amount of land acquired to the amount needed for the project.

The chart that you'll see there about a third of the way down on page 54 comes out of Title 5 and these are the amounts that the Department of Education says are

required for -- or Title 5 says are required for the number of kindergarten classrooms that are being provided. You'll see what those amounts are.

And so, for instance, if you're acquiring an acre to provide land to build a new kindergarten -- full-day kindergarten classroom -- well, actually, if it's one classroom, we're only going to be able to give you a third of that -- or a .3 of that I should say, a little less than a third.

So it's kind of like the way we do for SFP where the master plan, size of the site drives the amount of funding you can receive for site acquisition. It's kind of the same thing we're doing here.

I don't think there's anything different about 1860.10.1, 10.2, or 10.3 from SFP. There's nothing really different for full-day kindergarten. We just outline, you know, the site acquisition guidelines, hazardous waste removal at either a new site or an existing site. It's pretty standard stuff.

Moving on to page 56, 1860.11 sets the dollar for dollar matching share for new construction, 50-50, and then section 12 and 13 talk about retrofits. 12's very similar to what was in new construction. You have the K through 6 SFP modernization grant, the grant amount for a fire alarm per pupil.

We are providing 35 percent site development for retrofits as well. We heard from a lot of -- a few different districts that said if they were to provide more full-day kindergarten classrooms, there'd be -- the need for possibly recreating a drop-off and pick-up area. They might need to expand their playground or things like that. So that's why we're providing site development where we don't provide it in SFP for modernization.

And then we have the 50 percent for utilities for 50-year-old buildings, if you're retrofitting a 50-year-old building, and project assistance. And those amounts will also be upgraded -- or adjusted I should say through the CCI each year.

And section 13 talks about how it's a 60-40 match, just like modernization SFP.

MR. WATANABE: And then continuing down on page 56, this section we're asking a little bit of help on. It is a rule change on the funding process most likely. At the end of it, I'll explain why.

As written, when we were looking at this program how we fund the priorities, the statute specifies that low income districts -- financial hardship districts and low income school districts get a higher priority.

So when we initially created these regulations as written, we created a priority point system where based on

your free and reduced price meal percentage, the higher you are, the more points you get on that sliding scale.

And then we have those with financial hardship.

If you qualify for the program, you get another 40 points regardless of how much contribution. So if you qualify for financial hardship but you happen to have cash, you still qualify and get those 40 points.

Our initial thought was highest scoring points, you get a score first, we work down a list. And then as we looked at our regulations and how they're drafted here, we are at a point where if two school districts have the same percentage points, two districts got 80 points, how do you fund those two.

As we look at the regs, we said do a lottery between those two and based on whether it indicated -- whoever won that lottery, we would fund their first project and then we'd go onto the next school district. And we'd keep going down the percentage points.

And the initial tie breakers was if you got funded once in this round, then you're automatically eliminated from that process, assuming we have limited funds.

As we looked at that more, though, we don't know that school districts would do full-day kindergarten for one campus. We think if a school district wants to do full-day kindergarten, they're most likely to do it across the entire

school district. So just funding one project doesn't seem like a likely possibility. So we're seeking feedback on that.

The edit we're considering right now we still fund by highest priority but at the district level. So if you're the highest growing district in both categories and your total points are the highest in per each funding round, then we fund all of your projects before we go to the next highest point.

So a large school district in theory with a high free and reduced price meal and they're financial hardship, we'd be funding all their kindergarten classrooms first before we go to the next person in line.

And then we go to the next district points. Now, if we reach the case where two districts have the same points, we would do a lottery for that position in line. So we're seeking feedback on whether a lottery makes sense on funding for this program.

So if you have ideas, whether today or by email, of another way to fund the order -- and this continues all the way down the list.

If the round's big enough or if there's not enough apps or hit those projects where nobody has any points and we're just funding, we had intended date order received because it's a filing round. So we would follow the same

methodology there.

But once everybody has real points, we're not sure how we keep going down the list there. So -- beyond the lottery system.

So we definitely want some feedback. But that's one of the ideas you'll see going forward to the Board if we can get some good ideas that make sense. Otherwise, right now, the idea will be fund by points first and that's going down. So it's something to think about on that method.

.15 on the bottom of page 57 what's describing how you can qualify for hardship assistance. We are going to combine that with .16 just because it's just one sentence. So we're going to merge those two. So you'll see some reordering when we do the final version of the regs.

The financial hardship criteria, though, is essentially the same as the SFP. If you meet one of those first light switch tests based on your bond indebtedness as a district or your bonding capacity, passing a Prop. 39 bond within the last couple years, then you'll qualify for those 40 points.

Then just like SFP, the second determination is how much you contribute towards the project. So just like we do in SFP, we'll look at your facilities fund, what's available contribution and not encumbered towards projects, and apply that towards these projects.

Apart from SFP, the current rules for SFP are when we process your application, give you unfunded approval. If you sit on the unfunded list for more than six months before you actually get cash, we do a re-review to see if additional cash has become available.

Because cash is available immediately in this program, we're not doing the re-reviews. Once we say you have the cash and you set aside your apportionments, you keep your financial hardship status.

We're not going to go back and look at your funds. We're not going to redetermine if you're eligible for the program.

Once you're financial hardship, you stay financial hardship for that particular filing round.

We will not be asking for any financial hardship docs up front. We'll initiate you a scoring to see how you rank and who we're actually going to process for the Board that's within the filing round amount, and then we'll reach out to you and we're providing you 30 days to get us the financial documents to process that one.

Our financial hardship team based on their experience and when we've had to rush through re-reviews, they're thinking 30 days is sufficient. If school districts think otherwise, we'll welcome that feedback too as well.

On the top of page 59 under fund release process.

So as we talked about in prior meetings, we are allowing all school districts that don't have DSA approved plans to have the potential for advance fund releases for phases of the project.

So what .17(a) does is if you're requesting advance design funds on your application for funding, as soon as the Board approves your project and sets aside all the funds for your project, all you need to do is give us a signed grant agreement and then we will release 40 percent of your base grant for new construction or 25 percent of your base grant or retrofit grants upon receiving that site -- of that grant.

What .17(b) does is the same thing, but also if you're requesting site acquisition funding. So -- because this program will allow you to set aside cash, what you estimate your purchase price of your acquired land will be, we -- but you may not have actually purchased it yet, as part of the design grant, we also site that's equal to 2 percent of your preliminary appraisal to cover those site other costs.

So you can do your appraisal and your escrow fees, enter into escrow. Once you're into escrow, then you can -- you'll get a grant agreement for that before we release the funds as well and that's true for each phase of the fund releases.

And then lastly for site acquisition, just like SFP, once you've actually entered escrow, you have a purchase price, you'll submit your form 70-02 with us. You'll give us your final appraisal for that project dated within the six months.

You will give us your actual purchase price and that -- the site acquisition grants are the one grants we are adjusting at fund release. So we'll true it up and we will release those funds to you too.

And then lastly for (c) is the release of your construction funds. When you do your 70-02 fund release authorization, just like SFP, you'll need binding contracts for completion of the entire project. So we'll ask for the construction contracts.

If you had requested your site acquisition or any design funds, even though you intend to request those released early, we will release all remaining funds left in your account and move forward.

And then just like in SFP, if anything's not adjusted at that end, we also could adjust it at audit too. The two expenditures aren't aligned yet.

If we find your preliminary price quote's too low or you present only an estimate of what your site acquisition cost was too low, we can also, subject to available funds, increase your grants to the actual site

costs as well.

And then the other -- one other grant that we adjust at fund release is your multilevel grants. Once -- now that we have your DSA approved plans and you've entered the contract to build with your plans, if you chose not to build a multilevel classroom at that point in time, then we'll remove the multilevel grant from your project.

Now, .18 is grant agreement submittal, just indicating that priorities of each step of fund. We will request a signed updated grant agreement if needed. We'll walk through the grant agreement a little bit later today.

And then .19 is your program reporting requirements. This one I think we also will need to edit, but at the moment, one year after we apportion funds to your project, you will need to submit an expenditure report.

That expenditure report is due one year based on when you — the expenditure report is determined when your project is one year past your final fund release or the district tells us earlier that it's a hundred percent complete.

Based on those two dates -- and I think we need to add this. It's already written -- is we've also added a savings report requirement. Well, we haven't added it, but we've clarified it.

On the SFP under statute, you just report annually until your savings is spent. This program, because of the

1 limited time we have the funds, we're requiring all savings
2 be spent within one year of telling us your report's
3 100 percent complete.

So we don't expect a lot of savings in this program due to the dollar amounts, but if you do have savings, you report it with your final expenditure report or up to one year later.

Any savings after that one year will return to the program for reallocation.

Just like SFP also, unexpended funds on the project, if you received any financial hardship funding for the project, then there are no savings for financial hardship. That will be returned to the program.

We added some clarifying language we don't see in SFP, but we won't take back more savings than the actual financial hardship grant.

And then just like any SFP, any interest earned on state funds in your account while you're holding onto the money, that'll be allowed to be expended on eligible project expenditures, but if it's not expended by the end of the project or one year after on nonfinancial hardship projects, then that also will be returned back to the state.

1860.21 spells out the expenditure audit requirements. The statutes for this program mirror the current statues for SFP and that all the audits will go

through your local auditors. So our office will work -- and the process will be pretty much exactly the same.

Over the course of the next year, we'll work with the controller's office to update their audit handbook and build the audit program for there, but it's essentially the same as our program.

Just like SFP, there's no longer a point or cap on obtaining your documents. For audit, you retain your documents until the audit occurs.

And then lastly under .22, we think it's appropriate we add a requirement that you establish a routine -- which is your maintenance. Can't look in your general fund to maintain the facilities. And printed on your form when you apply for funding, the district will certify that they'll create that account as a plan.

Now, at this moment, that's the statute of limitation on that account, that you've created it, you have a plan to maintain your facilities. Beyond that, it's up to the district's responsibility that they actually do it.

The requirements for the 3 percent general fund deposit, 2 percent that that we've seen over the years, those are written in two SFP statutes. So we're -- that requirement doesn't -- you're not tied to those numbers, but we still have the expectation you create an account with the intent to maintain the facility. So that's where we're

1 | going with that one.

R

2 Okay. Questions on the regs so far? You can come on up.

MR. LAPASK: I wanted to add one thing too. We have made a few minor changes to the regulations since we've sent this out and it's really just things like authority sections and wording -- little wording things here and there.

Nothing substantive, but just to let everybody know that there probably -- they're still evolving and I'm sure they'll change a little more once this meeting's over too, but we haven't done anything major.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Elona Cunningham, Jack Schreder's office. I just have a quick question regarding the adjustments that can occur at the end for site acquisition and multistory.

So will you set aside some money because we think if you fund, for example, 50 million the first round and there's no money to make the adjustment, how will you make the adjustment?

MR. WATANABE: It's just SFP. If there's money there, we'll do the adjustment, but we're not going to set aside for it. So --

MS. CUNNINGHAM: So if you're out of money, the adjustment won't happen?

1 MR. WATANABE: Correct. 2 MR. LAPASK: Yeah. The first funding cycle, I 3 think we're identifying 37.5 million and then the remaining -- whatever the balance is after that will be the 5 second round. 6 MR. WATANABE: Yeah. I knew the adjustment for 7 site acquisition shouldn't be too high. We are requiring 8 you have a preliminary appraisal, so the school district 9 should have identified a site and provided a preliminary 10 appraisal when they think that would be so we don't expect 11 the adjustment to be too far off. 12 MS. CUNNINGHAM: Okay. 13 MR. WATANABE: But yeah, they're still subject to 14 general funds. Multilevel, all you need -- any district can 15 do this. If you think you're going to do multilevel, you 16 can check the box early and say I plan to do it and then if **17** you don't do it, we'll remove it. 18 MS. CUNNINGHAM: So it won't be an increase. 19 would only be a decrease. 20 MR. WATANABE: Most likely. 21 MR. LAPASK: For multilevel, yeah. 22 MS. CUNNINGHAM: Thank you. 23 MR. WATANABE: Uh-huh. 24 MR. YEAGER: Fred Yeager, Department of Education. 25 Just a quick clarification on the 2 percent. So in most

```
1
    cases, if this happens -- and I think it would be rare --
 2
    someone buys a third of an acre and it's worth 10,000 bucks.
 3
    2,000 is that to cover the appraisal to DTSC. The 2 percent
    doesn't seem to work at that small of a scale.
 5
              MR. LAPASK: The 2 percent other has a $25,000
 6
    minimum.
              That's the way it's written in. And it's to cover
 7
    things like you're saying, the soft costs kind of that are
    associated with acquisition.
 9
              MR. YEAGER: And 25-, like is that -- any -- is
10
    that what you're seeing these things cost when it --
11
              MR. WATANABE:
                             That --
12
              MR. LAPASK: Yeah. That's a good question.
13
    not sure we have numbers.
14
              MR. YEAGER: -- 20-year-old number --
15
              MR. LAPASK: Yeah.
16
              MR. YEAGER: -- whenever it is. So I don't know
17
    if that's a good number or a bad number or whatever it is.
18
    I expect it's a hardship type situation, what that is.
19
              MR. WATANABE: We actually don't have stored data
20
    on that --
21
              MR. YEAGER:
                           Yeah. How many are actually going to
22
    be buying a third of an acre or whatever it is but --
23
              MR. WATANABE: Right.
24
              MR. YEAGER: -- but -- yeah.
25
              MR. WATANABE: Also that's just like SFP, if you
```

don't spend it on your escrow costs, it rolls into your base 1 2 grant. 3 MR. LAPASK: Hello. MS. CURLY: Good morning. Rebecca Curly on behalf of Coalition for Adequate School Housing. I have a question 5 6 on the pupil grant request. New construction, but I guess 7 it could also be a question for the retrofit program. 8 Will it all be multiples of 25? So if you've got 9 one classroom, 25 grants, two classrooms, 50 grants? 10 Or is it going to be related to that number -- the 11 GAP number on -- let's say you've got 15 pupils that you 12 can't house with your facilities for a full-day 13 kindergarten. Will it all be multiples of 25 on the funding 14 side because there's also a relationship to the backend when 15 you adjust your baseline. I'm curious about that. 16 MR. WATANABE: -- on our examples? **17** MR. LAPASK: Did we round up on examples? 18 MS. CURLY: Yeah. I saw the examples, but, you 19 know, would you ever foresee a situation where if the new 20 construction filed a request for only 10 pupil grants rather 21 than 25? 22 MR. WATANABE: Yeah. I think what we've shown

is -- so if you have 26 kindergarten pupil facility, the

state load is at 25 kindergarten kids per classroom.

saw, say, 26 existing kindergarten kids on campus --

23

24

25

```
1
              MS. CURLY: Right.
 2
              MR. WATANABE: -- we would round up to show you
 3
    have a need for two classrooms. So you would have one
    existing kindergarten classroom. You have a shortfall of
 5
    one classroom. So we'd fund for one classroom --
 6
              MS. CURLY: Got it. So it's always going to the
 7
    loading standard is the equivalent of the grant --
 8
              MR. WATANABE: Yes.
 9
              MS. CURLY: Would a district have the option of
10
    requesting fewer than the 25 grants?
11
              MR. LAPASK: Well, you're not using eligibility.
12
    So it's -- you're going to -- it's going to be the number of
13
    pupils enrolled there.
14
              MS. CURLY: Yes.
                                I guess I'm thinking on the
15
    backend of the eligibility adjustment for the baseline.
16
    That's always going to be 25.
17
              MR. LAPASK: Yes.
18
              MR. WATANABE: That's true.
19
              MS. CURLY: Okay. Thank you.
20
              MR. WATANABE: Yeah.
                                    And also using your example,
21
    so if we saw 12 TK classroom pupils and 12 kindergarten
22
    classroom pupils, so you only have a combined total of 24,
23
    then that's only one classroom of need or --
24
              MR. LAPASK: Yeah. We wouldn't separate them.
25
    Yeah.
```

1 MS. CURLY: Got it. Thank you.

MR. WATANABE: Any other questions? Okay. Well, we'll move on to the forms. Beginning on stamped page 4. So we have three forms in the program. The first one is the application for funding. Very similar to how we have the SFP ones laid out. We tried to group things a little better than SFP that would migrate over time.

So we tried to group things together I guess you could say.

So the instructions kind of walk you through two things. One is you use this form to request the grants that you need for your project and based on these numbers is how we fund you.

So like we talked about multilevel. If you plan to do multilevel, then check the box, we'll give you the grant.

If you have DSA approved plans, then, you know, you won't -- you only check it if you actually have it.

On page 6 -- I'll walk you through the different sections. So parallel to the regs -- and we actually have to update those regulation sections there. So we have 1(a) through (g). So you have four applications to apply for the program.

The difference between them, (a) and (c), you have DSA approved plans. So if you're going to get cash

apportionments right away, you can request fund releases as soon as you can show us you have a construction contract.

Now, if you're applying under one, we wouldn't be giving advance releases for site or design. It's an all or nothing grant and release. And tied to those instructions, you'll see provide us your DSA plan approval number, provide us your DSA plan number, CDE's plan approvals, what have you.

And that's why this app is applicable throughout.

(b) and (c), you're requesting advance. So you don't have DSA approved plans. You may not have acquired site. Any time a project is not construction ready basically, you would go for those two types of grants.

In section 2 is the pupil grant we talked about. How many pupils are you requesting for this project? Do you have a shortfall of one classrooms, then you put 25 there; a shortfall of two classrooms, you put two.

Number of classrooms is tied to that number. So it's simple math right there.

(c) through (g) are all applicable. It depends on the nature of your project. If you're not requesting site acquisition, we won't necessarily request your site approval records. If you have DSA approved plans, you're construction ready, then we'd like to see those numbers there as you move forward.

So which box you check are tied to whatever you check in box 1 through (d).

3 is for your project priority funding order. So within a school district. So this is what the mindset, if we do a lottery for a certain place in line on the funding list, if the district wins a lottery, which project do they want us to fund first as we work down the list.

Even in the case of limited funds and we keep what our current proposal may be to fund the highest points for one school district first, if they have 20 projects, but we can only fund 10 of them, we need to know which ones they want us to fund in what order. So the priority projects is just to determine that.

4 is preference points. If you know your free and reduced price meal, are requesting priority, we request that you put that in. We're doing it based on the latest published info by CDE, so we can compare to that.

Box 4, if you're requesting points for priority for being a financial hardship district or are requesting financial hardship funding, you would check the financial hardship box. If you have your documents to qualify or if you are familiar with your Phase 1 documents, we'll work on separate checklists for this program, but if you have -- otherwise we'll process your app at that point.

But if you at least know you want the points,

check the box for that.

Box 5 is for if you had selected application type (a) or (b) in section 1, if you would like any of those grants, they are optional. Keep in mind it is a district matching program, so anything you request, you will have to match unless you're financial hardship.

Box 6, if you're requesting site acquisition funding, enter all the relevant amounts tied to the cost of your site. Hazardous waste, same thing there.

Box 7 is if you chose 1(b) or 1(d) for your type of application, you're doing a retrofit project and you request these grants, just check the box then.

And 8 is more for tracking purposes because we do a lot of questions -- get a lot of questions from school districts tied to your construction delivery method that you plan to use. In the case if you have a work plan -- a contract for this project, we'd like to know those dates as well.

Just like SFP, we ask for certification from your architect that the plans approved by DSA or that parts of it don't need to, if that's the case.

Moving onto page 7, we don't anticipate this being an issue, but just like SFP, we are asking the district architect to certify that 60 percent of the project is for construction-related work.

And then we updated all certifications strictly for this program. So anything that was SFP related, this mirrors what we have on applications for funding for the School Facility Program. Anything not tied to this program, we've removed and stripped it down to just what's tied to the full-day kindergarten program.

And then the only thing you need to know on the bottom of page 7, there's two check boxes on the bottom right there. If you have a certification or a school board resolution that you are going to begin full-day kindergarten and you already have that, you would check that box and put the date that resolution occurred or you'd check the other box that prior to the completion of this project, you'll have that in place by then. When you turn in your final expense report, we'll ask for a copy of that resolution at that point in time.

The next form is our 70-02, our fund release authorization form. So you do not need this form if you're requesting advance design funds. You just need to return your grant agreement and we will automatically release that.

If you're asking for just a release of site acquisition funds, we'll send you a grant agreement based on what you filled out on your application for funding.

Once you actually enter into escrow and have a full appraisal -- a final appraisal for that project, you

would check the various boxes. You'll need your CDE approval letters. Provide those to us and we will release your site acquisition funds so you can continue along with the purchase of your site.

And then at such time you're ready up to one year after your apportionment, you could do part 2 and request the release of your construction funds. So just like SFP, you certify that you have binding contracts for the completion of your project.

In the case of the full-day kindergarten though, you have to have your matching share at the time of fund release.

In the SFP, there's a clause that says by the time the project's done, you will have contributed, that part has been eliminated for this program. So you do need to certify the application here. Applicable matching share's already been deposited or expended prior to our fund release.

If you were funded with advance release of design funds, we're asking for your DSA approval with the application numbers. At this point in time, you should have signed by statute your contracts only after you have these approvals. So we're verifying those dates at this point in time.

And then part 4 on this form, just information for us so that we know where we are on the fund release process,

that you either have submitted a grant request -- grant agreement for this phase of the project or that it's accompanying the form.

And then lastly is our expenditure report form. It's a simplified form. We kind of mirror what we did in the Emergency Repair Program. This form is due upon completion of your project up to one year after fund release. We are asking for just a summary of all the district's funding.

So we'll help you do the math that we haven't done on some of our other forms, but use up all the district funds, interest earned on state funds, what your total expenditures. If you overspend the project, you know, we're done. If you have savings, then we ask you to fill that in the box (g).

If you have at this point in time you know you've already expended those savings, you'll move onto box 3 and also attach those expenditures. Just like all our other programs, we're asking for a detailed list of all your expenditures, warranty, warrant amounts, payees description -- a brief description of each one.

So the same thing then, if you know your expenditures or savings are reported with this form and you use box 3 for that. If you still have savings and haven't used it all up, you have one more year to report all your

savings to us. You would just resubmit this form again. We have two boxes in the upper right to show that you are doing a final savings report and you just report the last of your savings to us.

And then lastly, box 5, you check the box. If we didn't already receive your board resolution that you're doing full-day kindergarten, we'd ask for it at this point in time, that, okay, now that my project is done, I have my resolution, we are doing full-day kindergarten.

I think those are the forms. Any questions on those? Elona.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: I have a quick question regarding financial hardship. So if a district overspends in the kindergarten program and they're a financial hardship district and then three months later, they submit a funding application for an SFP project, will those over-expended funds be considered a contribution to the SFP project or are they completely different?

MR. LAPASK: Completely separate.

MR. WATANABE: Yeah. I think our intent is separate programs.

MR. LAPASK: We could check on that.

MR. WATANABE: We hadn't intended a three-year lockout, the full-day kindergarten program won't last long enough to do that. So if they're over-expended, we just

1 move on regardless --2 MS. CUNNINGHAM: Okay. So it won't be applied to 3 the --MR. WATANABE: We can clarify that. 5 MR. LAPASK: We'll clarify. Thank you. 6 MS. CUNNINGHAM: Thank you. 7 MR. WATANABE: Any other questions on forms? 8 Okay. We'll talk about the grant agreement now. 9 MR. LAPASK: Looking at page 12 in your packet, 10 you know, the grant agreement that we have here today, it's 11 very similar to the one that you are used to seeing for the 12 School Facility Program. 13 We went through and we updated all the references 14 accordingly. Of course, you know, it's all referring to 15 full-day kindergarten now in those forms, not the SFP forms, 16 but we really haven't changed much of it. **17** So unless anybody has specific questions about it, 18 I don't think I need to go through every section. There are 19 some differences that I would like to point out. 20 In the retrofit, if you turn to page 35, in the 21 retrofit area for the common eligible project expenditures, 22 we've added in some stuff there for site development because 23 we didn't have that in SFP, and we've added in the ability 24 to add square footage through the retrofit program as well,

so, you know, foundations and things like that that you

25

would need to do if you had to expand your room to meet the Title 5 requirements for a larger size or to build a bathroom on it, for instance.

But aside from that, there's really not anything major that we've changed in here other than, like I said, the references to authority and just all the different references throughout to -- you know, to not be the SFP anymore.

So I don't think that there's much more to say than that. It's a very similar document to what you've been seeing for the SFP now for quite some time, but we'd be happy to answer any questions you might have related to the grant agreement or anything else.

MR. WATANABE: So if we can, I want to circle back to the funding order because I know I see a little -- a few puzzled faces in the room. But if you have any thoughts now, I'd appreciate it. It may not be the best way. If not, definitely, please think about it, how it might work and shoot us some notes. We'd appreciate that.

Otherwise, right now, our thought is based on your true preference point scores and if your district has the most points, we fund all of your projects before moving to the next highest points and we just keep on going from there.

And then after that, when we reach the point that

```
1
    the points don't work anymore, then we do a lottery system,
 2
    district by district and then project by project.
 3
    it.
              MR. YEAGER: Michael, could you bring that chart
 5
    up again?
 6
                             The --
              MR. WATANABE:
 7
              MR. YEAGER: Yeah.
 8
              MR. WATANABE: This the chart you wanted?
              MS. JONES: Yes --
 9
10
                           Right. The look of how -- I couldn't
              MR. YEAGER:
11
    see the ranges of free and reduced price meal, what each
12
    amount, what's in there, but they would have equal weight
13
    the two factors being financial hardship is yes/no --
14
              MR. LAPASK: Yeah. It's 40 or zero basically.
15
              MR. YEAGER: -- at that point in time and then the
16
    other one --
17
                           We're looking at page 57 by the way.
              MR. LAPASK:
18
                           It's on up to a hundred percent,
              MR. YEAGER:
19
    so --
20
              MR. LAPASK:
                           Yeah. It starts at 60 percent and
21
    goes up to 100 and four points up to 40.
22
              MR. WATANABE: All right. As we pulled the free
23
    and reduced price data for the state, we sorted it in
24
    descending order, 100 percent down, to see what the impact
25
    would be and there -- the top I would say 80 percent are --
```

```
1
    or not top -- 80 percent and higher, there's not a lot of
 2
    huge school districts that we see where a huge school
 3
    district that would also be financial hardship, come in with
    a bunch of projects and take all the money. So we don't
 5
    anticipate it being issue, but it could be.
 6
              MR. YEAGER: And that school or district, free and
    reduced that's district?
 7
 8
              MR. WATANABE: That's based on district.
 9
              MR. LAPASK: District level.
10
              MR. YEAGER: -- the statute that says this.
11
              MR. LAPASK: Yeah.
12
              MR. WATANABE: Yeah.
13
              MR. YEAGER: All right.
14
              MR. LAPASK: And it'll be based on the time that
15
    they come in with their submittal. At that point basically
16
    is an as-of date.
17
              MR. YEAGER: All right.
18
              MR. WATANABE: Well, we haven't heard from a lot
19
    of school districts that it's a concern. What a school
20
    district -- because our first proposal was when the
21
    application for a school district --
22
              MR. YEAGER: Right.
23
              MR. WATANABE: -- before it'd come back around to
24
    the school district again. So we go around these school
```

districts, we don't know how many of these school districts

25

```
1
    would do full-day kindergarten for just one school site.
 2
              MR. YEAGER: Right. In a way, you know, if the
 3
    free and reduced price meals is more variable, so if that
    were a larger scale number of points on that side, would
 5
    that reduce the number of ties or kind of distribute it a
    bit more because a district's either 40 points or not on
 6
 7
    financial hardship. So if there's more variation or more
 8
    points given on that, it kind of targets a different piece.
              MR. WATANABE: Yeah. But you're still talking
 9
10
    about a district level, right?
11
              MR. YEAGER: Right. Or -- yeah. And -- because
12
    that is if there's a very large financial hardship district
13
    out there, you'll fund one district.
14
              MR. WATANABE: Yeah.
15
              MR. YEAGER: Yeah. That would do this.
16
              MR. WATANABE: Yeah.
17
              MR. LAPASK: Potentially. Potentially.
18
              MR. YEAGER: However, the handicapping has all
19
    that --
20
              MR. WATANABE: Yeah.
21
              MR. YEAGER: -- so -- and that is -- you know,
22
    it's like reassigning the weight of the free and reduced
23
    price meal that may alter it.
24
              MR. WATANABE: We had briefly considered financial
25
    hardship too -- making that a sliding scale based on say
```

```
1
    percentage of district contribution --
 2
              MR. YEAGER: Right.
 3
              MR. WATANABE: -- towards their match.
    you still have the same issue from a district to district
 5
    level. We fund one project for a school district or --
 6
              MR. YEAGER: Right.
 7
              MR. WATANABE: -- fund it school district by
 8
    school district.
 9
              MR. YEAGER: And so -- on the other side, so a
10
    very small school or district that has combination classes,
11
    say 12 and 12, kindergartens, first grade, so they're
12
    eligible for one --
13
              MR. LAPASK:
                           Yes.
14
              MR. YEAGER: -- one --
15
              MR. LAPASK: Yes.
16
              MR. WATANABE: A full classroom.
              MR. YEAGER: Even if they're sitting in a
17
18
    kindergarten designed classroom, so they get the first grade
19
    classroom.
20
              MR. WATANABE: No. Because the lack of facilities
21
    is the major requirement of the program. So if you have a
22
    kindergarten compatible classroom, CDE agrees that it is a
23
    kindergarten classroom, if you have 12 kids in there, then
24
    they are housed.
25
              MR. YEAGER: Even with first graders in it.
```

MR. WATANABE: Yes. You don't lack facilities for a kindergarten. I guess you could say you lack a first grade classroom.

MR. YEAGER: Right. Right. Right. Yeah. So build another kindergarten classroom, you'll have two and put first graders --

MR. WATANABE: Okay. All right. So please think about that. We will restructure the regs for that section a little bit. As Brian mentioned, our regs -- we found a few statute references. We're going to clean it up a little bit more for flow. We thought it more appropriate to move the financial hardship determination before you even get to the points for financial hardship from an ordering standpoint. So we're going to do a little bit reordering there.

There's a few grammatical stuff we'll clean up, but anything major we'll definitely point out on the full cover item. As we work towards the October Board, same thing we always do, we will -- our goal is to publish the final version at least a week before the Board so you can see that.

So if you have any other comments, like to see the final version. As we mentioned in the beginning, if by next Thursday you can submit us any ideas you have, any comments on anything, the forms, the grant agreement, the regulations, please email me and Brian or the full-day

kindergarten team. Their contact information is updated on our webpage now. Yeah. We're looking for all that so we have a clean product going forward and get the program moving. If there's no other questions or comments, I think that concludes the meeting. Thank you. MR. LAPASK: Thank you. (Whereupon, at 10:54 a.m., the proceedings were adjourned.)

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE			
2				
3	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) ss.			
4	COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO)			
5				
6	I, Mary C. Clark, a Certified Electronic Court			
7	Reporter and Transcriber, Certified by the American			
8	Association of Electronic Reporters and Transcribers, Inc.			
9	(AAERT, Inc.), do hereby certify:			
10	That the proceedings herein of the California			
11	State Allocation Board, Stakeholder Meeting, were duly			
12	transcribed by me;			
13	That the foregoing transcript is a true record of			
14	the proceedings as recorded;			
15	That I am a disinterested person to said action.			
16	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name on			
17	October 9, 2018.			
18				
19				
20	Mary C. Clark			
21	AAERT CERT*D-214 Certified Electronic Court			
22	Reporter and Transcriber			
23				
24				
25				